## REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the preceding amendments and following comments, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 remain pending in this application. Claims 1 and 4-9 are amended by this response. No claims are added or cancelled by this response.

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's indication in the Office Action Summary that the drawings filed on October 8, 2003 have been accepted by the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) and that the priority documents have been received by the USPTO.

Applicants thank Examiner Misiura for the telephonic interview granted the Applicants' representative on August 31, 2005. During the telephonic interview, the rejection to claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph was discussed. Examiner Misiura indicated that amending independent claim 1 to recite "a plurality of buses" instead of "at least one bus" and amending claims 2-9 to reflect the amendment to independent claim 1 would likely overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejections.

## Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. With respect to claim 1, the Office Action mailed August 4, 2005 states the phrase " 'the at least one data bus' (lines 8 and 9) portrays a system that can operate with a single data bus," and indicates it is unclear as to why a bilateral bridge would transmit data between the at least one data bus if there is only a single data bus.

In response to this rejection, independent claim 1 and dependent claims 2-9 have been amended consistent with the discussion between the Applicants' representative and Examiner Misiura during the telephonic interview on August 31, 2005.

Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to claims 1-9 obviate the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and therefore, respectfully request that the rejections to claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph be withdrawn.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants note with appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 10-20 are allowed over the prior art and that claims 1-9 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

**CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the objections and rejections and allowance of each of claims 1-20 in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact John A. Castellano at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By _____

John A. Castellano, Reg. No. 35,094

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

JAC/SAE:pw